APPENDIX IV.

(1) On Haidar's Position as Regent.

Wilks hardly specifies Haidar's constitutional position in Mysore from 1761 onwards, though even he, in one place in his work, *tacitly implies* that Haidar was still the *servant* of the King of Mysore in supreme authority. Thus, referring to the completion of Haidar's usurpation, he writes, "The arrangements consequent on the usurpation occupied upwards of two months, and Hyder, having appointed his brother-in-law, Mukhdoom Aly Khan, Killedar of Seringapatam with a garrison of his most trusty troops, *took leave of the Raja with the usual formalities* early in September (1761) and proceeded towards Bangalore where other events demanded his presence" (Wilks, *o. c.*, I. 486). Haidar's position as the Regent or *Sarvādhikāri* of Mysore has been set out in full elsewhere in the course of this work, with the necessary references (see *Ante* pp. 255-256, 280-290 *supra*). For the nearest parallel, we must turn to England. In English History, we read of the Barons assuming authority to appoint guardians and councils of Regency during the minority of a newly ascended monarch. Thus, for Henry III the Barons appointed William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, as *Rector Regis et Regni*, together with a small assistant council. For Richard II a council of Regency was provided by the joint action of the young king himself and the magnates. On the accession of Edward V, his father's councillors assumed the power and appointed Richard, Duke of Gloucester, as Protector. When a reigning king provided for his succession, Parliament chose subsequently to alter his arrangements, as in the case of the arrangements made by Henry V and Henry VIII. All modern

provisions for a regency are of course made by Act of Parliament.

(2) Sources of Mysore History of the Usurpation Period, 1761-1799.

For the history of Mysore during the usurpation period (1761-1799), Wilks' *Historical Sketches of the South of India in an attempt to trace the History of Mysoor* (2 vols. 1810) is the main source of information. Wilks lived too close to the times of Haidar Alī and Tipū Sultān and he generally writes from direct knowledge of materials to which he had ready access (and which he does not always cite), and from the testimony of others who actually witnessed or took part in the events he describes. While Wilks' work thus forms an indispensable authority for the period, it is more, as its title itself indicates, "an attempt to trace the History of Mysoor" than a detailed history of the kingdom. Indeed, "the characters of Haidar and Tipu and their history," as Sir Murray Hammick has recently observed, "were the chief interests for him in his book, and this fact perhaps hindered him from looking at certain episodes of the period from the point of view of the Ruling Family, to which Haidar in the main and Tipu during part of his sway, paid formal homage" (see *Note on Col. Mark Wilks* in the 1930 edition of Wilks' *Mysoor*, vol. I. p. xii). A critical and comparative study of the sources now available to us enables us to develop the history of the period from this broader standpoint, along modern lines, correcting and supplementing Wilks wherever necessary.

Among these, Mīr Hussain Alī Khān Kīrmāṇi's *History of Hydur Naik and Tipu Sultan* (also styled *Neshauni-Hydurī*, written in Persian and completed in the early years of the 19th century, and translated into English

and first published in 1842 by Col. W. Miles) and the anonymous work *Haidar-Nāmāh*, a manuscript *Bakhar* in Kannaḍa completed in 1784, occupy the foremost place as representing the genuine chronicles of the times of Haidar and Tipū from the local point of view. Both these sources are invaluable authorities for tracing the main currents of the history of the period, internal and external, though Kīrmāṇi writes from the Muslim point of view and the author of the *Haidar-Nāmāh*, who narrates from direct knowledge, is partial to Haidar and at times glosses over facts inconvenient to his patron. What make Kīrmāṇi particularly valuable is the special note he strikes in regard to the Trichinopoly episode. This is confirmed by the *Fort St. George Records* as set out in the text of this work in the appropriate places. Col. Miles remarks in in a note in his Preface at p. XVI: "Except with regard to Trichinopoly, it (the History of Kīrmāṇi) is generally consistent with Orme's account to 1760." Kīrmāṇi (at pp. 244-247) describes how Muhammad Alī obtained Mysore's help while besieged at Trichinopoly, and how he thus "gained the victory over his enemies" and later how the Mysore Chief was obliged to leave Trichinopoly "by the violation of the Treaty made with him by Muhammad Alī" (p. 245). Also, how after taking Pondicherry through English aid, Muhammad Alī plundered the Mansabdārs and Jāgīrdārs of the Arcot-Subāh and "raised the standard of independence, and rebelled against the Nizam of Hyderabad;" how the Nizām thought of displacing Muhammad Alī with the aid of Haidar and thus taking possession of the Karnātic for himself. The Nizām is said to have written to Haidar "setting forth that a body of English merchants, through the medium of the rebellious souba of the Karnātic, had taken into their heads the vain desire of chieftainship and rule, and had fearlessly raised the standard of usurpation in that quarter." He

concludes that Haidar joined the Nizām with his forces to Adoni and with Basālat Jang, the Nizām's brother, went towards Madras. Kīrmāṇi, however, notes that "another historian" has given a different version of this affair. According to this historian, he says, Muhammad Alī got "perplexed and uneasy" when he heard of the "prowess and discipline of the Nawab's (Haidar's) troop, and the promptitude of his military equipments," and regarding that his (Haidar's) rise would mean his own fall and "moreover apprehensive that the affair of Trichinopoly, where he had so grossly violated his faith, still rankled like a thorn in the breast of the Nawab, and God forbid, lest he should consequently turn his views towards Arcot, and with the energy of Khodadad, seize his country and wealth," Muhammad Alī induced the English, his friends, to send a vakīl to Hyderabad and persuade the Nizām to take the conquest of Bālaghāt. "His secret plan was, if possible, to take Mysore, if Haidar was unprepared, and retain it; if not, join him and operate advantageously in the destruction of his rebel Soubadār" (*i.e.*, Muhammad Alī).

Both the accounts make it plain that Haidar vowed vengeance against Muhammad Alī for the treachery he had played in the matter of the surrender of Trichinopoly to Mysore. In the campaign of Haidar that ended with the Treaty of Mangalore (March 11, 1784), Tipū, according to Kīrmāṇi, marched his army into "Tanjore and Trichinopoly (*Nathurnuggur*) (p. 418). His soldiers plundered Tanjore. Then he "spurred the steed of his plans and projects towards Nathurnuggur" (*i.e.*, Trichinopoly). He is said to have appointed *amīls* and independent *Killedārs* and large garrisons to various places in Trichinopoly area (such as Ariyalūr, Uḍaiyar-pāḷayam, etc.) and plundered Śrīrangam, Jambukēśvaram, etc. Tipū then left towards Kalicote (Calicut) and joined his father (p. 420). Haidar, "with

the intention to reduce as many of the *parganas* and towns of that (Trichinopoly) country under his own authority as he possibly could," marched to Trichinopoly and despatched his horse in front. Tipū and Lally were appointed to the western side of Trichinopoly (p. 424) and Saiyid Sāhib was despatched with infantry to conquer the country of Tanjore and Trichinopoly (*Nathurnuggar*) (p. 430). [See Vol. III, Chap. V of this work, for a more detailed treatment of this subject with special reference to Kīrmāṇi among other sources.]

This apart, while the chronological accuracy of the *Haidar-Nāmāh* for the affairs of the period 1761-1782 is undoubted, the *Śaka* dates for the events invariably tallying with the A.D. dates, Kīrmāṇi generally appears more as a verbose writer than as an accurate historian, for he adopts an ornate style with an exuberance of similies and metaphors, and the *Hijira* dates he gives for the events do not always tally with the A.D. dates. Nevertheless Kīrmāṇi seems to show in his narrative some acquaintance with earlier sources of information. He has, however, to be used with caution, making due allowance for literary flourishes and checking his dates with reference to other sources.

Eloy Joze Correa Peixoto's unpublished *Memoirs of Hyder Ally* (1770), M.M. De La Tour's *Ayder Ali* (1784) and Captain Francis Robson's *Life of Hyder Ally* (1786), among the contemporary European accounts of the life and times of Haidar, so far available, are next of considerable value for the history of Haidar's period of office as the Regent and Generalissimo of Mysore (1761-1782). Robson and De La Tour are, in particular, contemporary authorities for the war of 1767-1769, in which they both took part. (*The First Mysore War* ending with the *Treaty of Madras*, 1769). Col. Wilks refers to De La Tour in his work (I. 587) in a foot-note. From a single statement of his, Col. Wilks draws an adverse inference against

him and his general credibility as a recorder of what he saw or heard. This seems rather hard on him. Though he has to be used, like many other writers of his period, with due care, he supplies many details which others do not even hint at, much less refer to or describe. Robson is not referred to by Wilks, though Sir Murray Hammick, the Editor of his work, mentions him in his foot-notes (e.g., I. 549, 587 *et seq*). While Robson, the English writer who was a Lieutenant in Col. Smith's army, generally writes from the English point of view, Peixoto, the Portuguese writer, and De La Tour, the French writer, who were European officers under Haidar, show an intimate acquaintance with the affairs of Mysore during the period they served respectively under him. Their writings, which add to the information derived from other sources, are, however, to be used with caution, as they are sometimes prone to exaggerate and record from hearsay. The *Memoirs of Hyder Aly Khan and Tippoo Sultan* appended to Major Charles Stewart's *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Oriental Library of Tippoo Sultan* (1809), though slightly earlier in point of date than Wilks' work, are brief but uncritical accounts compiled mostly from unsifted materials, and hence require to be approached with prudence.

Among other European sources, Adrian Moens' *Memorandum* (1781) embodying an account of *Haidar Ali* (published in *Selections from the Records of the Madras Government—Dutch Records*, No. 13) is of some value as throwing interesting light on Haidar's relations with Malabar and Travancore down to 1781, though it is not wholly trustworthy. Captain Innes Munro's *A Narrative of Military Operations on the Coromandel Coast* (1789) contains a firsthand account of the early phases of the war of 1780-1784 (The *Second Mysore War*) from the English point of view by one who personally took part in it against Haidar, and forms an

admirable supplement to other sources. Lieut. Col. William Fullarton's *A View of English Interests in India* (1787) and the *Memoirs of the Late War in Asia* (1788) by an officer of Col. Baillie's detachment, are of value as throwing sidelights on the war in its later phases, down to the conclusion of the *Treaty of Mangalore* (1784). Lt. Col. William Kirkpatrick's *Select Letters of Tippoo Sultan* (1811), generally a work of considerable interest from the point of view of the administration of Tipū, contains also invaluable material for the political history of the early years of Tipū's regime down to 1786. The *Poona Residency Correspondence*, Vol. III (1937), published by the Government of Bombay, is of inestimable value as containing documents throwing a flood of light on the diplomatic background of the war of 1790-1792 (*The Third Mysore War*) ending with the *Definitive Treaty of Seringapatam* (1792), while Lieut. Roderick Mackenzie's *A Sketch of the War with Tippoo Sultaun* (2 Vols, 1793-1794), Major Dirom's *A Narrative of the Campaign in India, which terminated the War with Tippoo Sultan* (1793) and Lieut. Edward Moor's *Narrative of Operations of Captain Little's Detachment*, etc, (1794), are equally valuable sources for the different phases of that war. For the war which terminated with the fall of Seringapatam and the death of Tipū Sultān (*The Fourth Mysore War*, 1799), Col. Alexander Beatson's *A View of the Origin and Conduct of the War with Tippoo Sultaun* (1800) forms an excellent authority.

Among the documents, the *Letters* published in the volumes of the *Selections from the Peshwa Daftar* (Nos. 29, 35 to 38) are of value for the Mysore-Mahratta relations down to about 1780, while those published in the volumes of the *Calendar of Persian Correspondence* (Nos. 1 to 6) are useful for the Mysore-Karnātic-*cum*-English relations down to 1785. The select extracts

from the manuscript volumes of *Military Consultations, Secret Consultations, Country Correspondence, Tellicherry Factory Records* (*Diaries* and *Letters Received*), *Military Sundries, Despatches to England*, etc., of the *Fort St. George Records*, preserved in the *Madras Record Office*, and the documents published or referred to in the *Selections from Letters, Despatches, etc., in the Bombay Secretariat* (Maratha Series), *Press List of Records of the Foreign Department of the Government of India*, etc., are of unique interest as adding to our direct knowledge of the affairs of the period down to 1799 from the Mysore point of view, while the documents published in C. U. Aitchison's *A Collection of Treaties, Engagements and Sunnads* (Vol. IX, 1909) and the *Mysore State Papers* (Vol. I, 1920) give us an insight into the *Mysore Treaties* and the *Rāṇa Correspondence* which led to the restoration of the kingdom of Mysore to the Mysore Royal Family in 1799.